

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,543	11/26/2003	Toshitaka Hasegawa	1095.1291	5700	
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 10/25/2007		EXAMINER		
SUITE 700		ROBINSON,	ROBINSON, GRETA LEE		
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			. 2168		
			MAN DATE	DEL WERY MODE	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/721,543	HASEGAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Greta L. Robinson	2168	

	Greta L. Robinson	2168				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	on.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706 07/0					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office laternay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da b.	of the fee. The appropring the final Off te of the final rejection,	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b				
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, <ul> <li>(a)  They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,	<b>(</b>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 9-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	ned.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	-				
13.  Other:		Greta Robinson Primary Examiner October 24, 2007	<u> </u>			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendment to claims 3 and 6 changes the scope of the claim and would require updated search.

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejections cited under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and 35 USC 112 second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection cited under 35 USC 103(a) citing Kihl et al. in view of Lomet et al. is respectfully maintained as outlined in the Office Action mailed June 19, 2007. In the after final Applicant argued there is no specific reason why Lomet allegedly discloses the sending operation. In the client-server system, Lomet a client sends a request to a server and the server returns a reply to the requesting client [col. 5 lines 1-6]. The client creates log records for each request and reply message that it exchanges with the server inquiry and returns a reply to the requesting process [see: col. 11 lines 55-67]. Lomet provides for variations in processes which provide for consulting the log records for past replies [see: col. 5 lines 18-54]. Also, Kihl teaches a protocol processing and history information in which input request messages are analyzed and a corresponding handling process may be defined based on input [see abstract]; therefore a sepcific protocol for how messages are sent could be defined by the end-user.